

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-7, 16, 18, and 21-31 will remain pending in this application. Claim 26 is cancelled in the present amendment. Claims 8-15, 17, and 19-20 were previously cancelled. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the present amendment.

Claims 1-7, 16, 18, and 21-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,795,071 (“Tracey”) in view of “Interworkflow System: Coordination of Each Workflow System Among Multiple Organizations,” available at <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/iel4/5723/15313/00706283.pdf?isnumber=15313> (“Hiramatsu”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 16, 18, and 21-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tracey in view of Hiramatsu. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant understands the rejection to be based in part on the premise, as stated in the Advisory Action of October 16, 2007, that “Hiramatsu teaches the need for integration of multiple workflows across different organizations and ways of managing the interoperation of workflows. The data transfer step requires integration of data into existing databases, and this in turn requires ‘matching’ and ‘combining’ updated data about a user with existing data about a user (i.e., communication between workflows, see Hiramatsu, section 3.3). Furthermore, Tracey suggests the need to follow users through multiple processes.”

However, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 25 do not recite limitations relating to “matching” and “combining” updated data about a user with existing data about the user. Rather, independent claim 1 recites the limitations of “matching the related service entities based on the service metadata,” “combining the related service entities into a context entity that is a single entity derived from one or more service entities,” “combining service metadata corresponding to the context entity into context metadata,” and “matching the application entity to the context entity based on the application metadata and the context metadata.” Thus, it is the ***related service entities*** that are matched and combined

into a context entity, and it is *service metadata* that is combined into context metadata, rather than data about particular users. Independent claim 25, as amended, further recites that the related service entities are matched “by cross-referencing the attributes of the related service entities and identifying relationships between the related service entities based on a nomenclature of the attributes.”

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Tracey and Hiramatsu, considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose the invention as recited in claims 1 and 25. In particular, Applicant submits that Tracey and Hiramatsu fail to disclose at least the limitations of “matching the related service entities based on the service metadata,” “combining the related service entities into a context entity that is a single entity derived from one or more service entities,” “combining service metadata corresponding to the context entity into context metadata,” and “matching the application entity to the context entity based on the application metadata and the context metadata.”

Turning now to independent claim 16, the context service is recited as “maintaining a context entity derived from the first and second service entities” and “matching the application entity to the context entity.” The context entity is derived from service entities, not by combining updated data about a user with existing data about the user.

Based at least on the above reasoning, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 16, and 25 are patentable over Tracey in view of Hiramatsu. Applicant further submits that claims 2-7, 18, 21-24, and 27-31 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Applicant notes that claim 26 has been cancelled. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 301410.01 / MSFT-1948
Application No.: 10/648,507
Office Action Dated: July 20, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: November 27, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439